

Likelihood Inference for Large Scale Stochastic Blockmodels with Covariates based on a Divide-and-Conquer Parallelizable Algorithm with Communication

Sandipan Roy, Yves Atchadé*

Department of Statistical Science, University College London

Department of Statistics, University of Michigan

and

George Michailidis†

Department of Statistics & Informatics Institute, University of Florida

November 1, 2016

Abstract

We consider a stochastic blockmodel equipped with node covariate information, that is useful in analyzing social network data. The objective is to obtain maximum likelihood estimates of the model parameters. For this task, we devise a fast, scalable Monte Carlo EM type algorithm based on case-control approximation of the log-likelihood coupled with a subsampling approach. A key feature of the proposed algorithm is its parallelizability, by processing chunks of the data on several cores, while leveraging communication of key statistics across the cores during every iteration. The performance of the algorithm is evaluated on synthetic data sets and compared with competing methods for blockmodel parameter estimation. We also illustrate the model on data from a Facebook social network enhanced with node covariate information.

Keywords: social network, case-control approximation, subsampling, Monte-Carlo EM, parallel computation with communication

*The authors gratefully acknowledge *NSF awards DMS-1228164*

†The authors gratefully acknowledge *NSF awards DMS-1228164, DMS-1545277 and NIH award 7R21GM10171903*

1 Introduction

There has been a lot of recent work in modeling network data, primarily driven by novel applications in social network analysis, molecular biology, public health, etc. A common feature of network data in numerous applications is the presence of *community structure*, which means that a subset of nodes exhibits higher degree of connectivity amongst themselves than the remaining nodes in the network. The problem of community detection has been extensively studied in the statistics and networks literature, and various approaches proposed, including spectral clustering (White and Smyth (2005), Rohe et al. (2011) etc.), likelihood based methods (Airoldi et al. (2008), Amini et al. (2013), Nowicki and Snijders (2001) etc.), modularity based techniques (Girvan and Newman (2002)), as well as approaches inspired by statistical physics principles (Fortunato (2010)).

For likelihood based methods, a popular generative statistical model used is the *Stochastic Block Model* (SBM) (Holland et al. (1983)), that postulates the existence of communities and edges between communities are sampled at random with probabilities corresponding to entries of an inter-community probability matrix. However, on many applications, the network data are complemented either by node-specific or edge-specific covariates. Some of the available work in the literature focuses on node covariates for the SBM (or some variant of the SBM) (Tallberg (2004); Mariadassou et al. (2010); Choi et al. (2012); Airoldi et al. (2008)), while other papers focus on edge-specific covariates (Hoff et al. (2002); Mariadassou et al. (2010); Choi et al. (2012)).

In the proposed model, the logit of the edge probability is decomposed into a parametric component involving the covariates under consideration, while the intercept is replaced by the latent membership; specifically, for a K -class SBM we have that

$$\log \frac{P_{ij}}{1 - P_{ij}} = \theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i, j) \quad i = 1, \dots, n; j = i + 1, \dots, n \quad (1)$$

where n is the size of the network, P is the $n \times n$ matrix containing the edge probabilities between any two nodes i and j in the network and is assumed to be composed of the “latent” part given by $\theta_{z_i z_j}$ and the “covariate” part given by $\beta^T X(i, j)$, where $X(i, j)$ is a $q \times 1$ vector of covariates of the same order indicating shared group membership. A recent paper by Latouche et al. (2015) also considered a logistic model for random graphs with

covariate information. Their goal was to assess the goodness of fit of the model when a general term involving a set of latent variables on nodes is added to the covariate part in the model.

The objective of this work is to obtain maximum likelihood estimates for large scale SBMs with covariates; this entails computing the elements of the θ matrix, the class probability vector π and the regression parameter β . Typically parameter estimation in a large scale SBM is a challenging computational problem, since the latent structure of the model requires an EM-type algorithm to obtain the estimates. It is known (Snijders and Nowicki (1997); Handcock et al. (2007)) that each EM update requires $O(n^2)$ computations, an expensive calculation for large networks. Further, one also needs $O(nK)$ calculations to obtain the community memberships, which could also prove a computational expensive step for large n , especially if the number of communities K scales with n .

Amini et al. (2013) provided a pseudo-likelihood method for community detection in large sparse networks, which can be used for fast parameter estimation in a regular SBM, but it is not readily applicable to settings when a blockmodel has also covariates. Hence, there is a need to scale up likelihood-based inference for large networks with covariates. To that end we develop a parallelizable algorithm which allows communication between the processors handling pieces of the data during the iterations of the EM algorithm. As shown in Section 2, this communication step improves estimation accuracy, while creating little extra computational overhead, compared to a straightforward divide-and-conquer parallelizable algorithm. We believe that such an algorithm is particularly beneficial for inference purposes when the data exhibit intricate dependencies, such as in an SBM. The proposed algorithm is based on subsampling and enhanced with a case-control approximation of the log-likelihood.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2.1, we describe the general K-class SBM with covariates; we present the Monte-Carlo EM for SBM with covariates in Section 2.2; In Section 2.3 we give a general overview of the case-control approximation used for faster computation of the log-likelihood in large network data and also discuss about the specific approximation we used for the log-likelihood in SBM; In Section 2.4 we describe the two generic parallel schemes in estimating the parameters of the model; In

Section 2.5, we discuss the implementation of our parallel communication algorithm specific to the SBM case; In Section 2.6 we present a brief discussion about the bias reduction in the estimates obtained by our parallel implementation scheme. In Section 3, we show some numerical results of our algorithm on data simulated from large SBM with covariates. We also perform a comparison between our method and the pseudo-likelihood method (Amini et al. (2013)) for parameter estimation in SBM without covariates. We conclude with a real data application involving Facebook networks of US colleges with a specific number of covariates in Section 4.

2 Modeling Framework and a Scalable Algorithm

2.1 A SBM with covariates

Suppose that we have a 0 – 1 symmetric adjacency matrix $A = ((a_{ij})) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, where $a_{ii} = 0$. It corresponds to an undirected graph with nodes $\{1, \dots, n\}$, where there is an edge between nodes (i, j) if $a_{ij} = 1$. Suppose that in addition to the adjacency matrix A , we observe some covariates $X(i, j) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ on each pair of nodes (i, j) on the graph that influence the formation of the graph. In such cases, it is naturally appealing to extend the basic stochastic block model to include the covariate information. Let $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ denote the group membership of the n nodes. We assume that $Z_i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, and that the Z_i 's are independent random variables with a multinomial distribution with probabilities $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K)$. We assume that given Z , the random variables $\{a_{ij}, 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$ are conditionally independent Bernoulli random variables, and

$$a_{ij} \sim \text{Ber}(P_{ij}), \text{ where } \log \frac{P_{ij}}{1 - P_{ij}} = \theta_{Z_i Z_j} + \beta^T X(i, j), \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq n. \quad (2)$$

Here $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ is a symmetric matrix. The parameter of the model is $(\theta, \beta, \pi) \in \Xi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{R}^{K \times K} \times \mathbb{R}^p \times \Delta$, where Δ is the set of probability distributions on $\{1, \dots, K\}$.

The log-likelihood of the model for the observed data is given by

$$\ell(\theta, \beta, \pi) = \log \int_{\mathcal{Z}} L(\theta, \beta | A, z) \prod_{i=1}^n \pi_{z_i} dz_i, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{Z} = \{1, \dots, K\}^n$, and $L(\theta, \beta|A, z)$ is the complete data likelihood given by

$$L(\theta, \beta|A, z) = \prod_{i,j} \left(\frac{e^{\theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i,j)}}{1 + e^{\theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i,j)}} \right)^{a_{ij}} \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{\theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i,j)}} \right)^{1-a_{ij}}. \quad (4)$$

Although $\mathcal{Z}$ is a discrete set, we write it as an integral with respect to a counting measure for notation convenience. When n is large, obtaining the maximum-likelihood estimate (MLE)

$$(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\pi}) = \underset{(\theta, \beta, \pi) \in \Xi}{\text{Argmax}} \ell(\theta, \beta, \pi)$$

is a difficult computational problem. We describe below a Monte Carlo EM (MCEM) implementation for parameter estimation of the proposed SBM with covariates.

2.2 Monte Carlo EM for SBM with Covariates

Fitting blockmodels is a nontrivial computing task, especially for large networks. Typically MCMC is needed to update the latent variables z and hence Monte Carlo EM (Wei and Tanner (1990)) can be used to estimate the parameters in a SBM with covariates. Following are the steps for implementing the MCEM algorithm for a SBM with covariates.

- Initialize θ_0, β_0, π_0
- At the r -th iteration, do the following two steps.

1. (E-step) Approximate the function

$$\mathbb{E}_r(\log L(\theta, \beta|A, z)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_z \log L(\theta, \beta|A, z) p(z|\theta_r, \beta_r, \pi_r, A) dz$$

using Monte Carlo methods. This amounts to drawing M_r random samples $(z_{r+1}^{(1)}, \dots, z_{r+1}^{(M_r)})$, from $p(z|A, \theta_r, \beta_r, \pi_r)$, the conditional distribution of the latent variables given the observed data and the current parameters set. Use this Monte Carlo sample to approximate $\mathbb{E}_r(\log L(\theta, \beta|A, z))$ by

$$\hat{Q}(\theta, \beta, \pi; \theta_r, \beta_r, \pi_r) = \frac{1}{M_r} \sum_{m=1}^{M_r} \log L(\theta, \beta|A, z_{r+1}^{(m)}) \quad (5)$$

2. (M-step) Maximize the Q-function to obtain a new estimates:

$$(\hat{\theta}_{r+1}, \hat{\beta}_{r+1}, \hat{\pi}_{r+1}) = \underset{(\theta, \beta, \pi) \in \Xi}{\text{Argmax}} \hat{Q}(\theta, \beta, \pi; \theta_r, \beta_r, \pi_r).$$

- Repeat the above two steps for $r = 1, 2, \dots$ until convergence.

A mathematically convenient representation of the Monte Carlo EM algorithm is as a non-homogeneous Markov chain. Let $\mathcal{M}_r(\xi_r, A; \cdot)$ denote the conditional distribution of the output of the $(r + 1)$ -th iteration of the Monte Carlo EM algorithm described above, given $\xi_r = (\theta_r, \beta_r, \pi_r)$, and for a given adjacency matrix A . The probability distribution $\mathcal{M}_r(\xi_r, A; \cdot)$ is obtained as the result of the Monte Carlo samples generated during the $(r + 1)$ -th iteration. Using this notation, the Monte Carlo EM can be succinctly presented as follows. Choose some initial estimate $\xi_0 = (\theta_0, \beta_0, \pi_0) \in \Xi$. For $r = 1, \dots$, draw

$$\xi_{r+1} | \xi_0, \dots, \xi_r \sim \mathcal{M}_r(\xi_r, A, \cdot).$$

This representation is very convenient, and helps providing a clear description of the main algorithm introduced below.

The r -th iteration of the EM algorithm outlined above requires $\mathcal{O}(n^2 M_r)$ calculations, where M_r is the number of Monte Carlo samples used at iteration r and n the number of the network nodes. Note that in general, MCMC is needed to draw those Monte Carlo samples. As a result, large values of M_r are typically needed to obtain reasonably good estimates¹. This demonstrates that the computation of the maximum likelihood estimate for the SBM with covariates becomes computationally very expensive as n , the size of the graph, grows. The main bottleneck of the EM algorithm outlined above is the computation of the log-likelihood.

$$\log L(\theta, \beta | A, z) = \sum_{i < j} \left[a_{ij} (\theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i, j)) - \log \left(1 + e^{\theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i, j)} \right) \right]. \quad (6)$$

The case-control approximation (Raftery et al. (2012)) provides a fast approximation of the log-likelihood $\log L(\theta, \beta | A, z)$. A general overview about the case-control approximation and the specific implementation in a SBM with covariates are provided in the section below.

¹In fact, since the mixing of the MCMC algorithm would typically depend on the size of $\mathcal{Z}$ (and hence on n), how large M_r should be to obtain a reasonably good Monte Carlo approximation in the E-step depends in an increasing fashion on n .

2.3 Case-Control Approximation in Monte Carlo EM

The main idea of case-control approximations comes from cohort studies, where the presence of case subjects is relative rare compared to that of control subjects (for more details see Breslow (1996); Breslow et al. (1982)). In a network context, if its topology is relative sparse (there are a number of tightly connected communities, but there do not exist too many connections between members of different communities), then the number of edges (cases) is relatively small compared to the absence of edges (controls). Then, the sum in Equation (6) consists mostly of terms with $a_{ij} = 0$. and fast computation of the likelihood through case-control approximation (Raftery et al. (2012)) becomes attractive. Specifically, we can express the log-likelihood as

$$\log L(\theta, \beta | A, z) = \sum_{i=1}^n L_i \quad (7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_i &\equiv \sum_{j \neq i} \left\{ a_{ij} (\theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i, j)) - \log \left(1 + e^{\theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i, j)} \right) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{j \neq i, a_{ij}=1} \left\{ (\theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i, j)) - \log \left(1 + e^{\theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i, j)} \right) \right\} + \sum_{j \neq i, a_{ij}=0} \left\{ -\log \left(1 + e^{\theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i, j)} \right) \right\} \\ &= L_{i,1} + L_{i,0} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the sum in Equation (7) is over the rows of the adjacency matrix A i.e. L_i is the contribution to the likelihood from node i . The quantity $L_{i,0}$ can be viewed as a population total statistic which can be estimated as $\tilde{L}_{i,0}$ where

$$\tilde{L}_{i,0} = \frac{N_{i,0}}{n_{i,0}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_i} \left\{ -\log \left(1 + e^{\theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i, j)} \right) \right\}$$

with $N_{i,0}$ being the number of zeros in the i th row, $n_{i,0}$ the size of a simple random sample drawn from the total number of zeros in the i th row and finally the sum being over those randomly selected entries. Here $\mathcal{S}_i$ is a randomly selected control set for the i th node, such that $|\mathcal{S}_i| = n_{i,0}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$

$\tilde{L}_{i,0}$ is also an unbiased estimator of $L_{i,0}$. Since the random sample is drawn from the population of 0's (not connected nodes), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\tilde{L}_{i,0} \right) = L_{i,0}.$$

Hence one can use a relatively small $n_{i,0}$ to obtain an unbiased estimator for the contribution of the terms involving non-edges in the likelihood in Equation (7) and a faster computation of the log-likelihood is achieved. Other variants of case-control approximation using stratified case-control sampling (Raftery et al. (2012)), local case-control subsampling (Fithian and Hastie (2014)) etc. have been studied as well.

We describe here the particular form of the case-control approximated log-likelihood in a SBM with covariates. We approximate the log-likelihood $\log L(\theta, \beta|A, z)$ in Equation (6) by a case-control approximation (Raftery et al. (2012)). We write the approximate complete data log-likelihood as

$$\log \tilde{L}(\theta, \beta, \pi|A, z) = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i:z_i=k} \tilde{L}_i^{(k)} \quad (8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}_i^{(k)} = \sum_{j:a_{ij}=1} (\theta_{kz_j} + \beta^T X(i, j)) - \log \left(1 + e^{\theta_{kz_j} + \beta^T X(i, j)} \right) \\ + \frac{n_{i0}^{(k)}}{m_{i0}^{(k)}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{ik}} - \log \left(1 + e^{\theta_{kz_j} + \beta^T X(i, j)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

We have $|\mathcal{S}_{ik}| = m_{i0}^{(k)}$, the case-control sample size for the i th node selected from the k th class and $n_{i0}^{(k)}$ is the number of “zero connections” for the i th node selected from the k th class, $i = 1, 2, \dots, M_k$. For simplicity, we keep $m_{i0}^{(k)} = m_0$ for each i and k and choose $m_0 = \lambda r$, where λ is the average node degree of the network and r is the global case-to-control rate.

Now using Equation (8) in Equation (5) we can write the E-step of the MCEM for the $(r+1)$ th iteration ($r = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) as follows:

$$\widehat{\widehat{Q}}(\theta, \beta, \pi; \theta_r, \beta_r, \pi_r) = \frac{1}{M_r} \sum_{j=1}^{M_r} \log \tilde{L}(\theta, \beta, \pi|A, z_{(r+1)}^{(j)}) \quad (9)$$

Note that $\mathcal{S}_{ik}$, the randomly selected control set, is drawn only once before the start of the EM iteration based on the i th row of the adjacency matrix A . The latent variables $z_{(r+1)}^{(j)}$ are drawn from the distribution $p(z|A, \theta_r, \beta_r, \pi_r)$ using MCMC and M_r is the number of Monte Carlo samples at the r th iteration. The M-step then becomes

$$(\hat{\theta}_{r+1}, \hat{\beta}_{r+1}, \hat{\pi}_{r+1}) = \underset{\theta}{\text{Argmax}} \widehat{\widehat{Q}}(\theta, \beta, \pi; \theta_r, \beta_r, \pi_r) \quad (10)$$

Using the case-control log-likelihood reduces the computational cost of every EM iteration from $O(n^2 M_r)$ to $O(m_0 n M_r)$ where $m_0 \ll n$ is the case-control sample size.

As with the Monte Carlo EM algorithm, we will compactly represent the Case-Control Monte Carlo EM algorithm as a non-homogeneous Markov chain with a sequence of transition kernels $\{\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r\}$, where $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\xi_r, A; \cdot)$ denote the conditional distribution of the output of the $(r+1)$ -th iteration given $\xi_r = (\theta_r, \beta_r, \pi_r)$, and for a given adjacency matrix A . Here the probability distribution $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\xi_r, A; \cdot)$ is obtained as the result of the Monte Carlo samples generated, including the case-control samples.

2.4 Parallel Algorithms for Iterative Optimization

Parallelizable algorithms have recently become popular for very large-scale statistical optimization problems; for example Nedic and Ozdaglar (2009); Ram et al. (2010); Johansson et al. (2009); Duchi et al. (2012) considered distributed computation for minimizing a sum of convex objective functions. For solving the corresponding optimization problem, they considered subgradient methods in a distributed setting. Zhang et al. (2013) considered a straightforward divide and conquer strategy and show a reduction in the mean squared error for the parameter vector minimizing the population risk under the parallel implementation compared to a serial method. They considered statistical models such as large scale linear regression, gradient based optimization etc. The simple divide and conquer strategy of parallel implementation has also been studied for some classification and estimation problems by McDonald et al. (2009) and McDonald et al. (2010), as well as for certain stochastic approximation methods by Zinkevich et al. (2010) and by Recht et al. (2011) for a variant of parallelizable stochastic gradient descent. Dekel et al. (2012) considered a gradient based online prediction algorithm in a distributed setting, while Agarwal and Duchi (2011) considered optimization in an asynchronous distributed setting based on delayed stochastic gradient information.

Next, we provide the main steps of a naive parallelizable algorithm based on random subsampling without communication during the iteration phase and its communication based counterpart, schematically also depicted in Figure 1.





Figure 1: Parallel Non-communication and Parallel Communication Algorithm

Algorithm 1 Parallel Optimization via Random Subsampling without communication (PORSWOC)

Input: Adjacency matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, Number of machines T , sub-sampled Adjacency matrices $\{A^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^T$, where $A^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, initial estimates $\{\xi_0^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^T$ in T machines, Number of iterations R .

Output: $\bar{\xi}_R = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \xi_R^{(i)}$

- 1: *loop*:
 - 2: **parfor** $i = 1$ to T **do** (for each machine)
 - 3: *loop*:
 - 4: **for** $r = 1$ to R **do**, draw
 - 5: $\xi_r^{(i)} | \xi_0^{(i)}, \dots, \xi_{r-1}^{(i)} \sim \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{r-1} \left(\xi_{r-1}^{(i)}, A^{(i)}; \cdot \right)$.
 - 6: **end**
 - 7: **end**
-

Algorithm 2 Parallel Optimization via Random Subsampling with communication(PORSWC)

Input: Adjacency matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, Number of machines T , sub-sampled Adjacency matrices $\{A^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^T$, where $A^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, initial estimates $\{\xi_0^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^T$ in T machines, Number of iterations R .

Output: $\bar{\xi}_R = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \xi_R^{(i)}$

```

1: loop:
2: parfor  $i = 1$  to  $T$  do (for each machine)
3: loop:
4:   for  $r = 1$  to  $R$  do, draw
5:      $\xi_r^{(i)} | \xi_0^{(i)}, \dots, \xi_{r-1}^{(i)} \sim \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{r-1}(\xi_{r-1}^{(i)}, A^{(i)}; \cdot)$ .
6:      $\xi_r^{((i \bmod T)+1)} \leftarrow \xi_r^{(i)}$  ▷ communication among machines
7:   end
8: end

```

2.5 Approximate Parallel Monte Carlo EM

We describe here in detail the implementation of the approximate parallel MCEM. The key idea is that for a large network instead of working with the entire adjacency matrix in a single core, we draw several subsamples from the adjacency matrix based on some initial labeling of the nodes. Then we perform our approximate Monte-Carlo EM in each core on the subsampled data with a single round of communication among the cores after every iteration. **Algorithm 3** summarizes the details of the proposed approximate parallel MCEM based on random subsampling.

Before describing the specific algorithm we present some notations needed for explaining the algorithm. Let T denote the total number of machines as well as the total number of iterations. $S_1, \dots, S_T$ denote the T subsamples. z_0, θ_0, β_0 and π_0 denote the initial node label, initial link probability matrix, initial covariate parameter and initial class probability values respectively. Let $z_t^{(s)}$ denote the node label of the individuals in the s th machine at the t th iteration, where $s = 1, 2, \dots, T$. Similarly $\pi_t^{(s)}, \theta_t^{(s)}$ and $\beta_t^{(s)}$ denote the parameter estimates at the t th iteration in the s th machine. Since transferring the subsamples between

cores is an expensive communication step, we do the communication in a equivalent manner by transferring the estimates between the machines after every iteration.

Initial node labels z_0 are calculated via spectral clustering with perturbation (See Amini et al. (2013)). We use a random sampling based on the initial cluster labels to write Equation (7) as follows:

$$\log \tilde{L}(\theta, \beta, \pi | A, z) = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N_k}{I_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k(u)} \tilde{L}_i^{(k)} \quad (11)$$

$N_k = \sum_{i=1}^n 1(z_i^0 = k)$, I_k are the number of individuals sampled from the k th class and $\mathcal{I}_k(u)$ is the set of individuals randomly subsampled in the u th machine ($u = 1, 2, \dots, T$) from class k . Hence we have $|\mathcal{I}_k(u)| = I_k$ and as per the notations used in Algorithm 1 and 2 we can write $S_u = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{I}_k(u)$.

Next, we illustrate both the statistical and computational performance of the parallelizable MCEM algorithm *with* and *without* communication on a small network of size $n = 100$ with $K = 3$ communities and latent class probability vector $\pi = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)'$. The results, averaged over 30 replications, are depicted in Table 1.

Table 1: Estimation Errors and NMI Values for Balanced Community Size with Varying out-in-ratio (OIR)

Methods	estimation error(θ)	estimation error(π)	estimation error (β)	NMI(z)	Time
MCEM on Full Data	0.1721	0.1812	0.1578	0.6184	57.80sec
Parallel Communication	0.1921	0.2061	0.1643	0.5901	12.58sec
Parallel Non-communication	0.2202	0.2141	0.1793	0.6107	12.46sec

It can be seen that both versions of the parallel MCEM algorithm are almost five times faster than the serial one; further, the communications based variant is 10% inferior in terms of statistical accuracy on all parameters of interest, while the performance of the non-communication one is 20% worse than the full MCEM algorithm. Similar performance of the communications variant, albeit with larger estimation gains has been observed in many other settings of the problem.

Algorithm 3 Approximate Parallel MCEM

Input: Adjacency matrix of size $n \times n$, Number of machines T , Number of iterations T

Output: $\bar{\theta}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \theta_T^{(s)}$, $\bar{\beta}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \beta_T^{(s)}$ and $\bar{\pi}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \pi_T^{(s)}$

```
1: Compute initial node labels  $z_0$  and the initial parameter values  $\theta_0$ ,  $\beta_0$  and  $\pi_0$ 
2: Use initial node label  $z_0$  to draw  $T$  random subsamples  $S_1, \dots, S_T$  each of size  $m$  and
   send them to  $T$  machines available
3: loop:
4: for  $t = 1$  to  $T$  do
5:   loop:
6:     parfor  $s = 1$  to  $T$  do
7:        $\hat{\bar{Q}}_t^{(s)} \left( \theta, \beta, \pi; \theta_{t-1}^{(s)}, \beta_{t-1}^{(s)}, \pi_{t-1}^{(s)} \right) = \frac{1}{M_t} \sum_{j=1}^{M_t} \log \tilde{L} \left( \theta, \beta | A, z_{j,t-1}^{(s)} \right)$ 
8:        $\left( \hat{\theta}_t^{(s)}, \hat{\beta}_t^{(s)}, \hat{\pi}_t^{(s)} \right) = \underset{\theta}{\text{Argmax}} \hat{\bar{Q}}_t^{(s)} \left( \theta, \beta, \pi; \theta_{t-1}^{(s)}, \beta_{t-1}^{(s)}, \pi_{t-1}^{(s)} \right)$ 
9:     end
10:   loop:
11:     for  $s = 1$  to  $(T - 1)$  do
12:        $\left( \theta_t^{(s+1)}, \beta_t^{(s+1)}, \pi_t^{(s+1)} \right) \leftarrow \left( \theta_t^{(s)}, \beta_t^{(s)}, \pi_t^{(s)} \right)$ 
13:     end
14:      $\left( \theta_t^{(1)}, \beta_t^{(1)}, \pi_t^{(1)} \right) \leftarrow \left( \theta_t^{(T)}, \beta_t^{(T)}, \pi_t^{(T)} \right)$ 
15: end
```

2.6 Discussion of some Theoretical issues in Parallel Communication Scheme

Next, we provide a heuristic justification about the advantage of bias reduction via our parallel implementation scheme compared to the straightforward divide and conquer strategy. In the case of a blockmodel with covariates, a compact representation of the true iterative map $\mathcal{M}^{\text{true}}$ (the map which can be used with the entire dataset D) is hard to obtain, since the parameters θ and β are entangled in the complete data log-likelihood given in Equation (6). Further, the approximate random map based on random subsampling in

the i -th core involves two other layers of approximation -(1) case-control approximation of the log-likelihood given in Equation (8) and (2) Monte Carlo sampling of the latent node labels in the E-step of the MCEM.

Nevertheless, it can be shown under an assumption of a global contraction property of the true map $\mathcal{M}^{\text{true}}$ and the approximate random iterative map in the parallel MCEM together with an unbiasedness assumption of the approximate map that a bias reduction of the parameter estimates can be achieved compared to the non-communication parallel scheme. However, as indicated above, verification of these assumptions is a challenging problem, currently under investigation.

3 Performance evaluation

Next, we compare the performance of the communications and non-communications variants of the case control MCEM algorithm with the baseline MCEM algorithm using the full data. We simulate observations from the SBM given in Equation (2) as follows. We initialize node labels using spectral clustering with perturbations and evaluate the performance on the accuracy of estimating the link probability matrix (“ θ ”), class probabilities (“ π ”), covariate parameter (“ β ”) and the latent node labels (“ z ”).

Throughout this section we fix the number of communities $K=3$, network size $n = 1000$ while varying the “out-in-ratio”(OIR) (Decelle et al. (2011)) β as (0.04, 0.08, 0.2) which we term as *low* OIR, *medium* OIR and *high* OIR, respectively. The average degree λ takes values in the set (4, 8, 14), which we term as *low* degree, *medium* degree and *high* degree regimes, respectively. We also experiment with two different class probabilities for the 3 communities viz. $\pi = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)'$ (balanced community size) and $\pi = (0.5, 0.3, 0.2)'$ (unbalanced community size). We employ a global case-to-control rate $r = 7$, so that case-control sample size for parallel MCEM algorithm (both communication and non-communication version) is λr .

The link probability matrix θ is generated as discussed in the numerical results section in Amini et al. (2013). For parallel MCEM algorithm (both communication and non-communication version) we choose subsample size $I_k = 50$ from the k -th class where $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$. The performance of the three methods viz. (1) MCEM on full data,

(2) parallel MCEM with communication and (3) parallel MCEM without communication are evaluated by comparing the mean squared error (MSE) of the parameters and the Normalized Mutual Information (NMI) values (Amini et al. (2013)) for the latent node labels. All the simulations were performed over 30 replications.

Tables 2 and 3 depict the results. In Tables 2 and 3, the average degree is kept at 8. One can observe that the MSE for different parameters for parallel MCEM with communication is only around 10% worse than the corresponding values for MCEM on the full data. On the other hand, the non-communicative parallel version could be more than 50% worse than the MCEM on the full data and could possibly be even worse in the high OIR regime for unbalanced communities. The other noticeable finding from Tables 2 and 3 is that the gain in the parameter estimation error is larger for the communications based version in comparison to the non-communications one, whereas the gain in the NMI values is not significantly high. In other words, as we discussed in Section 2.6, the parallel communications version results in bias reduction compared to the non-communications one.

Tables 4 and 5 show the performance of the three different methods when the average degree λ is varied from the *low* to the *high* regime. The OIR is kept at 0.04 in both Tables. As before, we observe significant improvements in MSE for the communications version over its non-communications counterpart, with the gain being even higher for smaller λ values compared to the higher ones. Further, the performance of parallel MCEM with communication is close to the level of performance of MCEM on the full data over different values of λ . The NMI values for the communications version is around 4% better than the non-communications one. Comparison results are also given in Figure 2 and Figure 3, respectively.

We also compare **Algorithm 3** with the pseudo-likelihood method proposed by (Amini et al. (2013)) for maximum likelihood estimation of parameters in stochastic block model without covariates. For this comparison, we keep $\beta = 0$ in Equation (2). As before, we use two different settings- balanced and unbalanced community size and make the comparison in the bar diagrams given in Figure 4 and Figure 5, respectively. Also for each case we keep the average degree λ fixed at 8 and vary OIR as (0.04, 0.08, 0.2) and on another occasion we fix OIR at 0.04 and vary λ as (4, 8, 14). To compare the performance of our

algorithm and pseudo-likelihood method (Amini et al. (2013)) with respect to community detection we use bar diagrams of the NMI values under the settings described above. We observe from Figures 4 and 5 that overall in terms of estimation errors of the parameters θ and π our method performs better or similar to pseudo-likelihood method under different values of λ and OIR. On the other hand, in terms of NMI values pseudo-likelihood method performs little better compared to our method. In fact, in the two most difficult situations i.e. when λ is low (OIR is fixed at 0.04) and when OIR is high (λ is fixed at 8) estimation of the stochastic blockmodel parameters are significantly better by implementing **Algorithm 3** compared to pseudo-likelihood method. The gain in the community detection in terms of NMI values achieved by the pseudo-likelihood method is very little compared to our method in those scenarios. The simulation studies do convey the fact that for sparse networks and in cases where communities have high interactions (many real world networks have one or both of these features) among themselves **Algorithm 3** may be useful to apply compared to pseudo-likelihood method for likelihood inference in stochastic blockmodel.

Table 2: Comparison of performance of three different methods for $\lambda = 8$, $n = 1000$, $K = 3$ and balanced community size with varying OIR

OIR	Methods	est.err(π)	est.err(θ)	est.err(β)	NMI
0.04	MCEM on Full Data	0.0313	0.0893	0.0185	1.0000
	Parallel Communication	0.0340	0.0987	0.0232	1.0000
	Parallel Non-communication	0.0483	0.1194	0.0433	0.9000
0.08	MCEM on Full Data	0.0321	0.0916	0.0228	0.9876
	Parallel Communication	0.0349	0.1042	0.0320	0.9830
	Parallel Non-communication	0.0568	0.1377	0.0549	0.8939
0.2	MCEM on Full Data	0.0385	0.0988	0.0378	0.7916
	Parallel Communication	0.0406	0.1061	0.0476	0.7796
	Parallel Non-communication	0.0617	0.1459	0.0701	0.7534

Table 3: Comparison of performance of three different methods for $\lambda = 8$, $n = 1000$, $K = 3$ and unbalanced community size with varying OIR

OIR	Methods	est.err(π)	est.err(θ)	est.err(β)	NMI
0.04	MCEM on Full Data	0.0511	0.0879	0.0412	0.9510
	Parallel Communication	0.0604	0.0937	0.0644	0.9327
	Parallel Non-communication	0.0782	0.1185	0.0750	0.8681
0.08	MCEM on Full Data	0.0589	0.0933	0.0612	0.9054
	Parallel Communication	0.0736	0.1048	0.0732	0.8852
	Parallel Non-communication	0.0874	0.1253	0.0867	0.8428
0.2	MCEM on Full Data	0.0657	0.1041	0.0804	0.8251
	Parallel Communication	0.0803	0.1187	0.0954	0.7896
	Parallel Non-communication	0.1010	0.1503	0.1309	0.7314

Table 4: Comparison of performance of three different methods for $OIR = 0.04$, $n = 1000$, $K = 3$ and balanced community size with varying λ

OIR	Methods	est.err(π)	est.err(θ)	est.err(β)	NMI
4	MCEM on Full Data	0.0467	0.0885	0.0455	0.8532
	Parallel Communication	0.0508	0.0948	0.0516	0.8240
	Parallel Non-communication	0.0664	0.1343	0.0724	0.8084
8	MCEM on Full Data	0.0389	0.0703	0.0393	0.9976
	Parallel Communication	0.0451	0.0721	0.0487	0.9889
	Parallel Non-communication	0.0604	0.0925	0.0613	0.9670
14	MCEM on Full Data	0.0302	0.0508	0.0297	1.0000
	Parallel Communication	0.0340	0.0540	0.0354	0.9968
	Parallel Non-communication	0.0515	0.0805	0.0575	0.9856

Table 5: Comparison of performance of three different methods for $OIR = 0.04$, $n = 1000$, $K = 3$ and unbalanced community size with varying λ

OIR	Methods	est.err(π)	est.err(θ)	est.err(β)	NMI
4	MCEM on Full Data	0.0778	0.1189	0.0651	0.7832
	Parallel Communication	0.0853	0.1244	0.0706	0.7447
	Parallel Non-communication	0.1052	0.1605	0.1082	0.7192
8	MCEM on Full Data	0.0554	0.1087	0.0543	0.8982
	Parallel Communication	0.0628	0.1186	0.0612	0.8681
	Parallel Non-communication	0.0815	0.1419	0.0811	0.8337
14	MCEM on Full Data	0.0368	0.0974	0.0410	0.9889
	Parallel Communication	0.0433	0.1047	0.0478	0.9668
	Parallel Non-communication	0.0575	0.1286	0.0695	0.9334




Figure 2: Comparison of full MCEM, parallel communicative MCEM and parallel non-communicative MCEM in Stochastic Blockmodels with covariates. Estimation errors of θ , π and NMI values are given along the columns for low, medium and high OIR of the network respectively. The rows indicate the balanced and the unbalanced community size cases respectively. The black bar, grey bar and the white bar correspond to full MCEM, parallel communicative MCEM and parallel non-communicative MCEM respectively.

4 Application to Collegiate Facebook Data

We use the proposed model to analyze a publicly available social network data set. The data come from (<https://archive.org/details/oxford-2005-facebook-matrix>) that contains the social structure of Facebook friendship networks at one hundred American colleges and universities at a single point in time. This data set was analyzed by Traud




Figure 3: Comparison of full MCEM, parallel communications and parallel non-communications MCEM in Stochastic Blockmodels with covariates. Estimation errors of θ , π and NMI values are given along the columns for low, medium and high OIR of the network respectively. The rows indicate the balanced and the unbalanced community size cases respectively. The black bar, grey bar and the white bar correspond to full MCEM, parallel communicative MCEM and parallel non-communicative MCEM respectively.

et al. (2012) . The focus of their study was to illustrate how the relative importance of different characteristics of individuals vary across different institutions. They examine the influence of the common attributes at the dyad level in terms of assortativity coefficients and regression models. We on the other hand pick a data set corresponding to a particular university and show the performance of our algorithm and compare the clusters obtained from it with the ones obtained in case of fitting an SBM without covariates.

We examine the Rice University data set from the list of one hundred American colleges and universities and use our K-class SBM with and without covariates to identify group/community structures in the data set. We examine the role of the user attributes- dorm/house number, gender and class year along with the latent structure.

Dorm/house number is a multi-category variable taking values as 202, 203, 204 etc., gender is a binary ($\{0, 1\}$) variable and class year is a integer valued variable (e.g. “2004”, “2005”, “2006” etc.). We evaluate the performance of **Algorithm 3** fitted to SBM with covariate viz. model (2).

There are some missing values in the dataset although it is only around 5%. Since the network size is 4087 which is large enough, we discard the missing value cases. We also consider the covariate values only between year 2004 to 2010. Further, we drop those nodes with




Figure 4: Comparison of **Algorithm 3** with a Pseudo-likelihood method for parameter estimation in Stochastic Blockmodels. Estimation errors of θ , π and NMI values are given along the columns for low, medium and high degree of the network respectively. The rows indicate the unbalanced and the balanced community size cases respectively. The black bar denotes the estimation errors (or NMI values) for **Algorithm 3** and the white bar denotes corresponding values for the Pseudo-likelihood method.

degree less than or equal to 1. After this initial cleaning up the adjacency matrix in this case is of order 3160×3160 . We choose number of communities $K = 20$. The choice of the number of communities is made by employing Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) where the observed data likelihood is computed by path sampling (Gelman and Meng (1998)). The corresponding plot is given in Figure 6 where the possible number of communities are plotted along the horizontal axis and the BIC values along the vertical one.

Recall the K-class SBM with covariates

$$\log \frac{P_{ij}}{1 - P_{ij}} = \theta_{z_i z_j} + \beta^T X(i, j) \quad i = 1, \dots, n; j = i + 1, \dots, n \quad (12)$$

where P is the matrix describing the probability of the edges between any two individuals in the network and the probability of a link between i and j is assumed to be composed of the “latent” part given by $\theta_{z_i z_j}$ and the “covariate” part given by $\beta^T X(i, j)$ where β is a parameter of size 3×1 and $X(i, j)$ a vector of covariates of the same order indicating shared group membership. The vector β is implemented here with sum to zero identifiability constraints. We first do a basic plot (see Figure 7) of the degree distribution of the network




Figure 5: Comparison of **Algorithm 3** with Pseudo-likelihood method for parameter estimation in Stochastic Blockmodels. Estimation errors of θ , π and NMI values are given along the columns for low, medium and high OIR of the network respectively. The rows indicate the unbalanced and the balanced community size cases respectively. The black bar denotes the estimation errors (or NMI values) for **Algorithm 3** and the white bar denotes corresponding values for the Pseudo-likelihood method.

which clearly shows that the network has a skewed degree distribution.

We apply **Algorithm 3** to fit model (12) to the Rice university facebook network with three covariates dorm/house number, gender and class year. In the Figure 8 we present the heatmap of the edge probabilities in estimated θ (latent part in Equation (12)) matrix and a bar diagram showing the estimated class probabilities. We observe from Figure 8 that block 9 has the largest proportion of individuals, but do not exhibit strong ties among the individuals present in it as the corresponding entry in the diagonal of the θ matrix is very small.

We also plot the communities found by fitting a SBM without covariates ($\beta = 0$ in model 2) and a blockmodel with covariates to the given data. We arrange the adjacency matrix rows according to the clusters/communities found by the two methods. The estimate of the parameter beta linked with the covariate effects is given by

$$\hat{\beta} = [0.7956, -0.1738, -0.6218]'$$

Further, we use an information based criterion generally used to compare two different




Figure 6: Plot of BIC values for possible number of communities in the Rice University dataset




Figure 7: Plot of the degree distribution of the Rice University network

sets of clustering solutions when the ground truth is not known. We use a metric called variation of information (VI) to compare the two sets of clusters. (For any two sets




Figure 8: Heatmap plots for the edge probability matrix and the bar plot of the class probabilities for parallel MCEM applied to SBM with covariate

C and C' of clusters, VI is given as $VI = H(C) + H(C') - I(C, C')$ where $H(.)$ is the entropy function and $I(.,.)$ is the mutual information between the two sets of clusters.). We compute the metric VI and it is calculated to be 0.1245.

We further present a table which describes how similar the two cluster labels are viz. the one obtained via fitting without covariate blockmodel and the other obtained via fitting the covariate blockmodel. We also indicate in the last column of the table the effect of the possible covariates if the similarity percentage drops below 70%. Figure 10 indicates that the two sets of clustering solutions obtained from the SBM model with and without covariates differ only in few specific instances.

5 Supplementary Materials

We provide the Matlab codes for the simulations and the real data analysis in the supplementary materials. The Rice University dataset is also provided there. All the materials are zipped into a file named `supp_materials.zip`. This file include a




Figure 9: Community detection plots for parallel MCEM with and without covariate respectively.

detailed readme file that describes the contents and instructs the reader on their use. All the supplementary files are contained in a single archive and can be obtained via a single download.

References

- Agarwal, A. and J. C. Duchi (2011). Distributed delayed stochastic optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 873–881.
- Airoldi, E. M., D. M. Blei, S. E. Fienberg, and E. P. Xing (2008). Mixed membership

		Group	Size of the Group	Similarity Percentage	Possible Cause of deviation
		1	102	94.12%	-
		2	604	82.28%	-
		3	183	100%	-
		4	129	62.79%	Possible effect of class year
		5	79	96.20%	-
		6	124	97.58%	-
		7	61	100%	-
		8	170	38.24%	effect of dorm and a little effect of gender as well
		9	176	92.61%	-
		10	168	97.02%	-
		11	134	91.04%	-
		12	44	93.18%	-
		13	208	65.87%	effect of dorm and little effect of class year as well
		14	189	58.73%	effect of class year
		15	170	100%	-
		16	58	100%	-
		17	70	100%	-
		18	221	75.57%	-
		19	70	100%	-
		20	201	98.51%	-

Figure 10: Table showing difference in the communities found by without covariate and with covariate SBM

stochastic blockmodels. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 9, 1981–2014.

Amini, A. A., A. Chen, P. J. Bickel, and E. Levina (2013, 08). Pseudo-likelihood methods for community detection in large sparse networks. *Ann. Statist.* 41(4), 2097–2122.

Breslow, N., N. Day, and J. J. Schlesselman (1982). Statistical methods in cancer research. volume 1-the analysis of case-control studies. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 24(4), 255–257.

Breslow, N. E. (1996). Statistics in epidemiology: the case-control study. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 91(433), 14–28.

- Choi, D. S., P. J. Wolfe, and E. M. Airoldi (2012). Stochastic blockmodels with a growing number of classes. *Biometrika*, asr053.
- Decelle, A., F. Krzakala, C. Moore, and L. Zdeborová (2011). Asymptotic analysis of the stochastic block model for modular networks and its algorithmic applications. *Physical Review E* 84(6), 066106.
- Dekel, O., R. Gilad-Bachrach, O. Shamir, and L. Xiao (2012). Optimal distributed online prediction using mini-batches. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 13(1), 165–202.
- Duchi, J. C., A. Agarwal, and M. J. Wainwright (2012). Dual averaging for distributed optimization: convergence analysis and network scaling. *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on* 57(3), 592–606.
- Fithian, W. and T. Hastie (2014). Local case-control sampling: Efficient subsampling in imbalanced data sets. *Annals of statistics* 42(5), 1693.
- Fortunato, S. (2010). Community detection in graphs. *Physics reports* 486(3), 75–174.
- Gelman, A. and X.-L. Meng (1998). Simulating normalizing constants: From importance sampling to bridge sampling to path sampling. *Statistical science*, 163–185.
- Girvan, M. and M. E. Newman (2002). Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99(12), 7821–7826.
- Handcock, M. S., A. E. Raftery, and J. M. Tantrum (2007). Model-based clustering for social networks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 170(2), 301–354.
- Hoff, P. D., A. E. Raftery, and M. S. Handcock (2002). Latent space approaches to social network analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 97(460), 1090–1098.
- Holland, P. W., K. B. Laskey, and S. Leinhardt (1983). Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social networks* 5(2), 109–137.

- Johansson, B., M. Rabi, and M. Johansson (2009). A randomized incremental subgradient method for distributed optimization in networked systems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 20(3), 1157–1170.
- Latouche, P., S. Robin, and S. Ouadah (2015). Goodness of fit of logistic models for random graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.00286*.
- Mariadassou, M., S. Robin, and C. Vacher (2010). Uncovering latent structure in valued graphs: a variational approach. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 715–742.
- McDonald, R., K. Hall, and G. Mann (2010). Distributed training strategies for the structured perceptron. In *Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 456–464. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- McDonald, R., M. Mohri, N. Silberman, D. Walker, and G. S. Mann (2009). Efficient large-scale distributed training of conditional maximum entropy models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1231–1239.
- Nedic, A. and A. Ozdaglar (2009). Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization. *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on* 54(1), 48–61.
- Nowicki, K. and T. A. B. Snijders (2001). Estimation and prediction for stochastic block-structures. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 96(455), 1077–1087.
- Raftery, A. E., X. Niu, P. D. Hoff, and K. Y. Yeung (2012). Fast inference for the latent space network model using a case-control approximate likelihood. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 21(4), 901–919.
- Ram, S. S., A. Nedić, and V. V. Veeravalli (2010). Distributed stochastic subgradient projection algorithms for convex optimization. *Journal of optimization theory and applications* 147(3), 516–545.
- Recht, B., C. Re, S. Wright, and F. Niu (2011). Hogwild: A lock-free approach to parallelizing stochastic gradient descent. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 693–701.

- Rohe, K., S. Chatterjee, and B. Yu (2011). Spectral clustering and the high-dimensional stochastic blockmodel. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1878–1915.
- Snijders, T. A. and K. Nowicki (1997). Estimation and prediction for stochastic blockmodels for graphs with latent block structure. *Journal of classification* 14(1), 75–100.
- Tallberg, C. (2004). A bayesian approach to modeling stochastic blockstructures with covariates. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 29(1), 1–23.
- Traud, A. L., P. J. Mucha, and M. A. Porter (2012). Social structure of facebook networks. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 391(16), 4165–4180.
- Wei, G. C. and M. A. Tanner (1990). A monte carlo implementation of the em algorithm and the poor man’s data augmentation algorithms. *Journal of the American statistical Association* 85(411), 699–704.
- White, S. and P. Smyth (2005). A spectral clustering approach to finding communities in graph. In *SDM*, Volume 5, pp. 76–84. SIAM.
- Zhang, Y., J. C. Duchi, and M. J. Wainwright (2013). Communication-efficient algorithms for statistical optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 14, 3321–3363.
- Zinkevich, M., M. Weimer, L. Li, and A. J. Smola (2010). Parallelized stochastic gradient descent. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2595–2603.